

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 30, 2005 and Office Communication dated October 3, 2005 providing the correct reference number for an applied reference and a new Form 892, have been received and their content carefully reviewed.

By this Response, the specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error, and claims 1, 2 and 10 are amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office, claims 1-20 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for his suggestions and have amended independent claim 1 accordingly. As such, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-14, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,266,116, issued to Ohta et al. (hereafter “Ohta”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 20020093027, issued to Zhong et al. (hereafter “Zhong”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Ohta nor Zhong, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Ohta and Zhong fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein the plurality of pixels are divided into at least four sub-pixels of a 2x2 matrix array, and wherein a liquid crystal molecule alignment direction of each sub-pixel is different from a liquid crystal molecule alignment of each of the sub-pixels of a vertically adjacent pixel, respectively” as recited in amended independent claim 1 of the present application.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Ohta does not disclose “the device is comprised of pixels, wherein each pixel includes sub-pixels of red, green, blue”. To compensate for this deficient teaching of Ohta, the Office Action relies upon Zhong. However, Applicants respectfully submit Zhong fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Ohta.

Zhong discloses, “as illustrated in FIG. 1, color filter 101 is a red color filter, color filter 102 is a green color filter, color filter 103 is a blue color filter, and layer 104 is a substantially clear material” (paragraph [0056, lines 1-4]). Further, as shown in FIG. 3, “the exterior periphery of each color filter 101-103 extends beyond the outer periphery of the corresponding pixel electrode 3, so that each color filter 101-103 (and layer 104) defines a greater surface area than the corresponding pixel electrode 3” (paragraph[0058], lines 5-9). As such, Applicant submit Zhong fails to teach “the plurality of pixels are divided into at least four sub-pixels of a 2x2 matrix array, and wherein a liquid crystal molecule alignment direction of each sub-pixel is different from a liquid crystal molecule alignment of each of the sub-pixels of a vertically adjacent pixel, respectively” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, Zhong fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Ohta.

Because Zhong fails to teach or suggest at least the above features of independent claim 1, even if Zhong’s teachings of the color filters were used to modify the device of Ohta, which Applicants do not concede there is proper motivation to do, the resulting device would fail to provide all the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, the resulting device of Ohta and Zhong would fail to provide “the plurality of pixels are divided into at least four sub-pixels of a 2x2 matrix array, and wherein a liquid crystal molecule alignment direction of each sub-pixel is different from a liquid crystal molecule alignment of each of the sub-pixels of a vertically adjacent pixel, respectively” as recited in amended independent claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 3, 5-7, 9-14, 16 and 18-20 are allowable over any combination of Ohta and Zhong.
Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 8, 15 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in these claims. Applicants elect not to rewrite these claims to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner an opportunity to reconsider the claims of the application in view of the above amendments and remarks.
Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant